

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 095 610

EA 006 302

AUTHOR
TITLE

Lutz, Frank W.; Caldwell, William E.
The Measurement of Principal Rule Administration
Behavior and Its Relationship to Educational
Leadership.

PUB DATE
NOTE

Apr 74
14p.; Paper presented at American Educational
Research Association Annual Meeting (59th, Chicago,
Illinois, April 1974)

EDRS PRICE
DESCRIPTORS

MF-\$0.75 HC-\$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
*Behavior Theories; *Educational Research; Factor
Analysis; *Leadership Styles; *Organizational
Climate; *Principals; School Environment; Teacher
Administrator Relationship; Teacher Attitudes
*Rule Administration Behavior

IDENTIFIERS

ABSTRACT

The theoretical and operational relevance of the school principal's rule administrative behavior is described. Lutz and Evans (1968) conducted field studies in six schools to determine if the types of rule administration identified by Gouldner (1954) had similar effects in education. Buttmann-type scales were developed and utilized to determine the relationship between the principal's rule administration and his leadership (Lutz and McDaniel, 1972 and Caldwell and Spaulding, 1972). Data on all principals were factor-analyzed. The factors proved both strong and mutually exclusive. Scales were used to determine relationships between organizational variables. (Authors)

THE MEASUREMENT OF PRINCIPAL RULE ADMINISTRATION BEHAVIOR AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

by

Frank W. Lutz
The Pennsylvania State University

and

William E. Caldwell
The Pennsylvania State University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPY-
RIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Frank W. Lutz &
William E. Caldwell
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL IN-
STITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRO-
DUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM RE-
QUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT
OWNER.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Presentation Paper
American Educational Research Association
April 18, 1974

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this paper is to provide insights into the theoretical background, related research, and subsequent development of the Rule Administration Scale, with particular emphasis on the implications for administrative and leadership behavior at the level of the building principal. Additionally this effort recognizes the applicability of theories of human and organizational behavior arrived at outside of the educational setting, based on the notion that concepts from general social science theory are descriptive of global human organization behavior rather than specific behavior (Lutz and Evans, 1968) and as such are useful predictors for educational administration and organization.

CONCEPTUAL-THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The origin for the Concept "Principal Rule Administration Behavior" is based on a sociological inquiry into the dynamics of a gypsum mine and factory operation by Alvin Gouldner (1954) which focused on the rules governing the behavior of both management and workers. From that study Gouldner identified three distinct classes of rules that govern bureaucratic behavior within an organization. These were mock rules,

NOTE: This paper, or any of its parts, may not be reproduced without permission of the authors.

ED 095610

EA 006 302

representative rules, and punishment-centered rules. An analysis of the rules produced insights into the variant bureaucratic patterns within the factory. One of Gouldner's first observations was that the "No Smoking" rule was ignored by most personnel, except under unusual circumstances. One such circumstance was when the fire inspector from the insurance company visited the plant; in this case, ample warning was given to the workers that no one should be smoking. Gouldner hypothesized that the reason for the nonobservance of this rule was that this regulation was initiated by the company; that is, the management was compelled to endorse the rule or face cancellation of its insurance policy. Since there was little inflammable material around, the workers could see no justifiable reason why they should not smoke. The workers did not believe that "management has the right to institute any kind of rule merely because they have the legal authority to do so. A rule must also be legitimated in terms of the group's values, and will be more readily accepted if it is seen as furthering their own ends" (Gouldner, 1954, p. 184).

Enforcement of the no smoking rule would only have heightened the visibility of existent status differences, allowing to one group distinct privileges denied to another. Since the plant office had a permit allowing its occupants to smoke, the workers felt that they should be allowed to smoke in the factory.

The no smoking rule is a pattern possessing the following characteristics:

1. The rule was neither enforced by the plant management nor obeyed by the workers.
2. The rule created little tension and conflict between the two groups and in fact seemed to enhance their solidarity.
3. Both the customary violation and occasional enforcement of the rule buttressed the informal sentiments and behavior of the participants (Gouldner, 1954, p. 186).

This pattern has been called "mock bureaucracy," because although many of the bureaucratic cues were present (rules, signs calling for enforcement and inspection) in the normal working day this bureaucratic paraphernalia was ignored and inoperative.

The safety rules comprised an area which was more bureaucratically organized than any other in the plant. As a preliminary indication of the high degree of bureaucratization, one is confronted by the immensity and complexity of safety rules applicable to the plant as a whole, as well as only to specific divisions of the factory. Not only was the system of safety rules complex, but considerable stress was placed upon conformity to them. Unlike the no smoking rule, the safety rules were not observed occasionally, but continually.

Closely planned and regularly conducted safety meetings were one of the techniques designed for generating conformance to the safety program. These meetings were presided over by the safety and personnel manager who, on the basis of his superior and specialized knowledge, was expected to detect unsafe conditions in the plant, and to call them to the attention of the appropriate foremen.

In the safety program, there was a very different pattern of rule administration than in the case of the no smoking rule. This type of pattern, called "representative bureaucracy," differed from the "mock bureaucracy" in that:

1. The rules were ordinarily enforced by the management and obeyed by the workers.
2. Adjustment to the rules was obtained, not by ignoring them, but by "education" and involving the workers and the union in their initiation and administration.
3. Like the no smoking rule, the safety program generated few tensions and little overt conflict between workers and management. Solidarity between the two groups was the result of their mutual acceptance of the program, rather than their joint rejection of it. Solidarity developed through the interaction that arose in the process of securing conformance with rather than avoidance of the rules (Gouldner, 1954, p. 204).

Gouldner distinguished "punishment-centered bureaucracy" from "mock" and "representative" bureaucracies in that responses to deviations from the rules take the form of punishments. This particular type is composed of two subpatterns, depending on who exercises the punishment and who receives it. In any case, management utilized punishments, directing them against workers; Gouldner labeled this the "disciplinary" pattern. The second subtype was labeled the "grievance" pattern, "for the union-grievance machinery is one of the most commonly used instruments by means of which workers inflict punishment on management" (Gouldner, 1954, p. 207).

The best example of the "disciplinary" pattern was the no absenteeism rule, in which the workers had to account for what they did outside of the plant. Absenteeism was particularly valued by the workers and it served as a personalized way of giving vent to dissatisfaction that arose in the course of the working day. By bringing the out-of-plant behavior within the view and permission of the foreman, the no absenteeism rule challenged the workers' control over a wide range of activities. When the worker returned from an absence, the supervisor had to decide whether the excuse was a legitimate one, and if not, determine the appropriate punishment.

The "bidding system" was an example of rules enforced by the "grievance" pattern. Originally incorporated into the labor-management contract at the initiative of the union, the bidding rules specified that "all job vacancies and new jobs shall be posted within five (5) days after such a job becomes available, for a period of five (5) days, in order to give all employees an opportunity to make application in writing for such jobs. Such application shall be considered in the order of seniority in the department, provided, however, that the ability of the applicant to fill the requirements of the job shall also be considered. If no one in the department bids for the job, bidding shall be opened to other employees" (Gouldner, 1954, p. 208).

This system could easily be interpreted by management as infringing upon its prerogative to transfer, hire, or promote workers. Initially, then, top management disapproved of the "bidding system," seeing in it a challenge to its status. However, under continued union pressure, top management accepted bidding, mainly because it recognized that most jobs in the plant required relatively little skill.

Thus, the "punishment-centered" bureaucratic pattern can be characterized by the following features:

1. The rules in which the pattern was organized were enforced, but primarily by one group, either by management or workers, rather than by both.
2. Adjustment to the rules was not by ignoring them or by educating the deviant or involving him in the rule's administration, but by punishing him.
3. The pattern was associated with considerable conflict and tension (Gouldner, 1954, p. 214).

RELATED RESEARCH

Recognizing the potential implications for administrative behavior in the educational setting, Lutz and Evans (1968) employed Gouldner's bureaucratic rule model and investigated the assumption that the same observable phenomenon operated in the educational setting as well as in the industrial setting. The effort attempted to discover the relationship between a principal's administration of rules, and the kind of leadership behavior the principal exhibited in the school setting. Additionally, the effect of the union contract upon the leadership behavior of the principal was examined.

The following hypotheses were formulated:

1. Mock rule administration would develop positive sentiment and no tension.
2. Representative rule administration would develop a little tension but considerable positive sentiment.
3. Punishment-centered rule administration would result in high tension and hostility.

A six-week field study was conducted to develop the model in which two groups of schools were identified, each having a different type of educational leadership climate.

The separate climates were determined to be peaceful and hostile. Each group contained an elementary, junior, and a senior high school.

Using the Executive Professional Leadership Questionnaire (Gross and Herriott, 1965) it was theorized that the determinant in warm leadership climates and positive personal relationships was the presence of a representative pattern of rule administration. Schools with representative patterns of rule administration frequently utilized informal paths for participation, but not to exclusion of formal means.

Mock patterns of rule administration were observed in both types of leadership climates although they were more present in the peaceful climate than in the hostile climate. In both climates, evidence of teacher rule breaking was aided and abetted by the administration.

When examples of mock behavior were observed in peaceful or warm climates, positive expression about the act was also in evidence. Hostile climates, where mock behavior was evidenced, produced a skeptical attitude that seemed to suggest, "We'll wait and see, it can't last" (Lutz and Evans, 1968, p. 150).

In the field study, punishment-centered behavior always created tension and general hostility, even in warm leadership climates. While punishment-centered behavior was present in both climates, the researchers, predictably found this behavior more frequently in the hostile climate. Additionally Lutz and Evans noted, as did Gouldner, two other important aspects of rule administration -- "The use of a rule by a principal to mask his authority will reduce tension or an occurrence of a punishment-centered behavior, and close supervision is usually viewed by teachers as punishment-centered behavior" (Lutz and Evans, 1968, p. 150).

Additionally, with regard to the effect of the union contract upon the leadership behavior of the principal, it was concluded that all grievances are not personal indictments of the administration. Occasional grievances are the result of a violation of an agreement by an administrator. It was further noted that on other occasions, grievances initiated by the union represented an effort to obtain a written policy as part of the formal agreement.

Based on this research, Lutz and Evans presented a range of possible rule administration behaviors available to the principal and the attendant consequences of each behavioral pattern. Consequently, it has been hypothesized that a principal can determine the rule administration behavior pattern that will result in either a hostile or peaceful relationship between the principal and the staff. The implications of these findings for principal behavior are evident.

Perhaps the most significant finding of the field study was that representative bureaucracy appeared to be the most important single factor in determining positive relationships between management and staff within a school.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE INSTRUMENT

The above field study provided the impetus for further research with regard to the management behavior of principals. The Lutz and Evans' study provided for some amount of "grounding," and consequently the generation of additional hypotheses and a new direction were forthcoming.

Caldwell (1973), recognizing the need for a more quantitative and comprehensive approach with regard to principal behavior related to the administration and enforcement of rules toward teachers, concentrated efforts on the development of an instrument to quantify such behavior. The underlying motive for the development of such an instrument was that the quantification of the principal's rule administration behavior would generate further testable hypotheses, and consequently result in greater insights into middle management positions within the educational organization. In this manner, the principal's perceived rule administration behaviors could be quantified and the relationship with other variables could be ascertained. Also, the development of an instrument to quantify the principal's rule administration behavior based on teacher perception would eliminate the need for the costly and time-consuming field study approach.

Initially, Caldwell and McDannel (1973) formulated a set of forty-eight statements that were descriptive of rules that generally are found in elementary school buildings. Simultaneously, Caldwell and Spaulding (1973) approached the quantification

of the secondary principals' rule administration behavior. Using Gouldner's typology, these statements were equally divided into classifications related to the three types of rule administration behavior that were observed in the original field study. Sixteen statements indicated representative rule behavior; sixteen statements indicated mock behavior; and sixteen statements indicated punishment-centered rule administration. These statements were worded and phrased according to each of the three classifications of rule administration behavior. The phrase, "assume you had a good reason" served as an indicator of representative behavior; the key word "ignore" served to distinguish mock behavior from other types of behavior; and the phrases "has a method of checking on you" and "would penalize you" provided the connotation for punishment-centered behavior.

Pilot questionnaires were administered to two groups of 100 teachers who had a minimum of one year of teaching experience. These data were analyzed using the Guttman (1944) technique, and the discriminating power of each question was determined. Those questions with the best predictive power were retained and constituted the final instruments (APPENDIX A). Subscales were developed for Representative, Mock, and Punishment-centered Rule Administration Behavior.

Guttman (1944) reported that a scale with a coefficient of reproducibility greater than .90 is considered to be an indicator of a scale with maximum scalability. He also noted that scales with reproducibility coefficients of more than .80 are generally acceptable in empirical studies. The following coefficients of reproducibility have been reported for the representative, mock, and punishment-centered subscales: Caldwell-McDannel: .913, .879, .875; Caldwell-Spaulding: .903, .914, .920.

Additionally, it was necessary to determine if the subscales were mutually exclusive and strong. To that end, data were collected from 25 elementary schools and 25 elementary principals from 285 elementary teachers in both rural and urban/suburban school districts. Similar secondary school data were collected on 25 secondary principals from 360 teachers. The subscales were determined to be both exclusive and unidimensional (APPENDIX B).

SUBSEQUENT INVESTIGATIONS

With the assurance that the Principal Rule Administration Scales were valid and reliable scales to measure teacher perception of the management behavior of principals with regard to their administration and enforcement of rules, a series of investigations was undertaken.

Caldwell and McDannel (1973) employed the Rule Administration Scales on the elementary school level to measure the relationship between the principal's rule administration behavior and the teachers' perception of the principal's leadership ability and the teachers' militancy. On the secondary level, Caldwell and Spaulding (1973) conducted a simultaneous investigation. Both of these investigations hypothesized that particular rule administration behavior patterns of principals would be related to teacher perception of the principal's leadership ability and teacher militancy.

A significant relationship was found on both levels between punishment-centered rule administration behavior and teachers' perception of low professional leadership on the part of the principal. A significant relationship was also found between representative-centered rule administration behavior and teachers' perception of high professional leadership. With regard to mock rule administration behavior, it was reported that mock behavior as exhibited by principals is highly related to teacher's perception of low principal professional leadership ability. These investigations provided a rationale for the behavior of principals with regard to the administration and enforcement of rules toward the professional staff. The implications for management behavior of principals are again evident.

Other investigations have been undertaken to determine the extent of relationship between the principal's rule administration behavior and other measurable variables that affect behavior within our schools. Caldwell and Easton (1974) are presently investigating the relationship between the superintendent's management behavior and teacher's perception of the principal's rule administration behavior. Garber (1974) is examining the effect of the principal's rule administration behavior on the climate of the elementary

school, while Caldwell and Marshall (1974) are studying the relationship between the rule administration behavior of elementary principals and the pupil control behavior of teachers. Preliminary findings of these investigations are to be reported in follow-up sessions to this presentation.

COMMENT

The framework that predominant administrative behavior patterns are of crucial importance to the organizational efforts of the schools has provided the impetus for studies related to administrative-leadership in education. Insights into the effects of administrative behavior have often focused upon the behavior of the principal. Bidwell (1965) identified the principalship as a key role for organizational analysis. The role of the principal, as evidenced by his behavior, is acknowledged to be the single most important determiner of educational climate in any school (Halpin, 1967).

From reviewing and considering the contents of this presentation, it is possible to recognize further implications of principal behavior. The perceptions of the principal's behavior by the professional staff with regard to rule administration has discernible consequences for principal-teacher work relationships. In the hierarchical arrangement, such a superordinate-subordinate relationship is often a significant factor in promoting sound organizational health.

The concepts presented in this paper have implications with regard to the administration of educational organizations; for if any measure of administrative effectiveness and efficiency is to be achieved, it must be based upon an awareness of insights into leadership behavior and the attendant consequences of such behavior.

REFERENCES

- Bidwell, Charles E., "The School as a Formal Organization," Handbook of Organizations, edited by James G. March (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1965).
- Caldwell, William E. and Charles Marshall, "The Relationship Between the Rule Administration Behavior of the Elementary School Principal and Teacher-Pupil Control Behavior," American Educational Research Association presentation, April, 1974.
- Caldwell, William E. and H. Dale Spaulding, "The Effect of the Secondary High School Principal's Rule Administration Behavior on Staff Militancy and Leadership Perception," American Educational Research Association presentation, March, 1973.
- Caldwell, William E. and James H. Easton, "The Relationship Between the Superintendent's Management Behavior and Teachers' Perception of the Principal's Rule Administration Behavior," American Educational Research Association presentation, April, 1974.
- Garber, Bernard, "The Effect of the Principal's Rule Administration Behavior on the Climate of the Elementary School," American Educational Research Association presentation, April, 1974.
- Gouldner, Alvin W., Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1954).
- Gross, Neal and Robert E. Herriott, Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965).
- Guttman, Louis, "A Basis for Scaling Qualitative Data," American Sociological Review, IX (1944).
- Halpin, Andrew, Theory and Research in Administration (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1970).
- Lutz, Frank W. and John A. McDannel, "The Effect of the Elementary School Principal's Rule Administration Behavior on Staff Militancy and Leadership Perception," American Educational Research Association presentation, March, 1973.
- Lutz, Frank W. with Seymour Evans, The Union Contract and Principal Leadership in New York City Schools (New York: Center for Urban Education, 1968).

APPENDIX A RULE ADMINISTRATION SCALE FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

GENERAL DIRECTIONS

1. Please indicate your choice by placing a check (✓) in the appropriate space following each question.
2. The question should be answered in light of your principal and your feelings.

Directions:

It is recognized that a teacher would consult the principal before he or she undertook some of the actions described below. Please assume that the principal was not available at that time and that he later became aware of your action.

	Never	Rarely	Usually	Almost Always	Always
1. If you failed to complete a specific form for the central office, he would ignore it.	1. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. If you arrive late some morning, he would assume you had a good reason and ask for it.	2. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. If you missed an assigned duty (lunch, bus, etc.), he has a way of checking and would penalize you.	3. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. If you had a class party at some other than the approved times, he would ignore it.	4. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. If you did not attend a P. T. A. meeting, he has a method of checking and would penalize you.	5. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. If you failed to turn in your lesson plans on time, he would assume you had a good reason and ask for it.	6. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
7. If you did not give achievement (or other type) tests on the assigned day, he would ignore it.	7. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
8. If you left your class unattended for a short time, he would assume you had a good reason and ask for it.	8. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
9. If you came to school late some morning, he has a method of checking and would penalize you.	9. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
10. If you failed to complete a particular form for the central office, he would penalize you.	10. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
11. If you left a door or window open during a fire drill, the principal would ask for your reason.	11. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
12. If you had a class party at some other than the approved times, he would ignore it.	12. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
13. If you used the office telephone for a personal call, he would assume you had a good reason and ask for it.	13. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
14. If you left school early, he has a method of checking and would penalize you.	14. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
15. If you failed to complete a form for the central office, he would assume you had a good reason and ask for it.	15. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
16. If you did not turn in your attendance report (or other paper work) on time, he would ignore it.	16. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
17. If you did not turn in your lesson plans by the assigned time, he would be aware of it and penalize you.	17. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
18. If you missed a parent-teacher conference, he would ignore it.	18. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
19. If you did not appear for an assigned duty (lunch, bus, etc.), he would assume you had a good reason and ask for it.	19. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
20. If you arrived late some morning, he would probably ignore it.	20. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____

RULE ADMINISTRATION SCALE FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL

GENERAL DIRECTIONS

1. Please indicate your choice by placing a mark (x) in the appropriate space following each question.
2. The questions should be answered in light of your principal and your feelings.

Directions:

It is recognized that a teacher would consult the principal to do some of the following before he or she took such action. For this section, please assume that the principal was not available and that he later became aware of your action. If in some of the following areas your principal operates through an intermediary (assistant principal, department head, etc.), respond as if his actions are taken with the knowledge of the principal. For example, a question may be interpreted as:

"If you failed to attend a P.T.A. meeting, the principal (or his intermediary) has a method of checking and would penalize you."

	Never	Rarely	Usually	Almost Always	Always
1. If you left school early, the principal has a method of checking and would penalize you.	1. ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. The principal would assume you had a good reason if you failed to appear for an assigned duty, such as hall duty, cafeteria duty, or some other assigned activity.	2. ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. If you failed to complete a particular form (report cards, attendance report, etc.) on time, he would ignore it.	3. ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. If you did not enforce building discipline regulations, the principal would assume you had a good reason and ask you for it.	4. ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. The principal would know and take action against you if you failed to follow the proper procedures before, during, and after a field trip.	5. ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. He would probably ignore it if you did not follow the proper procedures during a fire drill.	6. ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. If you left your class unattended for a short time, he has a method of checking and would penalize you.	7. ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. He would assume you had a valid reason and ask you for it if you did not complete a particular form (report cards, attendance report, etc.) within the designated time.	8. ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. The principal would ignore it if you failed to appear for a scheduled parent-teacher conference.	9. ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. If you failed to follow the proper procedure for ordering or requesting supplies, the principal would penalize you in some way.	10. ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. If you did not appear for an assigned duty, such as hall duty, cafeteria duty, or some other assigned activity, the principal would ignore it.	11. ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. The principal would assume you had a good reason if you did not attend a scheduled teachers' meeting.	12. ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. He would disregard it if you failed to follow the proper procedures before, during, and after a field trip.	13. ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. If you did not appear for a scheduled parent-teacher conference, the principal would take some type of action against you.	14. ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. If you failed to follow the proper procedures during a fire drill, he would believe you had a good reason and ask for it.	15. ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. The principal would disregard it if you did not attend a scheduled teachers' meeting.	16. ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. If you failed to follow the proper procedures before, during, and after a field trip, he would assume you had a good reason for doing so.	17. ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. He would probably ignore it if you left school early.	18. ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. The principal can check and would penalize you if you did not follow the proper procedures during a fire drill.	19. ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

14
APPENDIX B

THE ROTATED MATRIX OF FACTOR LOADINGS FOR ELEMENTARY
TEACHERS ON THE RULE ADMINISTRATION SCALE

Factor Identity and Question Number	Representative	Mock	Punishment- centered
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
M1	0.14283	-0.63974	-0.01915
R2	-0.68194	0.28208	0.01713
P3	-0.07342	0.01467	-0.74492
M4	0.05268	-0.69703	0.16246
P5	0.05821	0.05867	-0.67396
R6	-0.64291	0.04993	-0.06700
M7	0.08633	-0.65216	0.03499
R8	-0.67855	0.09630	-0.07326
P9	-0.08352	0.06819	-0.79417
P10	-0.04869	0.10956	-0.74135
R11	-0.48593	0.26110	-0.23460
M12	-0.02732	-0.75802	0.13022
R13	-0.54802	-0.03829	-0.15558
P14	-0.22025	0.15173	-0.68578
R15	-0.62771	0.28565	0.01866
M16	-0.16555	-0.56833	-0.10899
P17	-0.21697	-0.01280	-0.68542
M18	0.27183	-0.34607	0.10973
R19	-0.70065	0.08618	-0.08276
M20	0.30559	-0.62732	0.19929

THE ROTATED MATRIX OF FACTOR LOADINGS FOR SECONDARY
TEACHERS ON THE RULE ADMINISTRATION SCALE

Factor Identity and Question Number	Representative	Mock	Punishment- centered
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
P1	-0.04929	-0.08187	0.63818
R2	-0.73289	0.08344	-0.07395
M3	0.06631	0.52954	-0.15105
R4	-0.66730	-0.19949	-0.04459
P5	-0.13310	-0.29166	0.53396
M6	-0.05075	0.60711	-0.06571
P7	-0.04741	-0.05960	0.72745
R8	-0.62192	-0.29873	-0.00641
M9	-0.08161	0.47349	0.03947
P10	-0.15803	0.05221	0.61754
M11	-0.04066	0.65596	-0.11647
R12	-0.66738	0.25893	-0.06637
M13	0.04810	0.69820	0.08450
P14	0.04524	-0.11103	0.56594
R15	-0.66070	-0.08950	0.15537
M16	-0.04777	0.62161	-0.22978
R17	-0.66193	0.37090	0.06147
M18	0.01977	-0.60760	-0.27627
P19	-0.02736	-0.10270	0.75803